

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 EVAN RATCLIFF,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 ROMEO ARANAS, ET AL.,

10 Defendants.
11

Case No. 2:18-cv-00721-RFB-DJA

ORDER

12 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Order re Service (ECF No. 145),
13 filed on November 23, 2020. Defendants filed a Response (ECF No. 147) on December 7, 2020
14 and Plaintiff filed a Reply (ECF No. 149) on December 14, 2020.

15 Plaintiff requests that Defendants be ordered to send him a copy of all papers, pleadings
16 and motions via U.S. First Class mail rather than via cm/ecf because the prior law library
17 supervisor was gone. (ECF No. 145). He claims that he has no access to his legal mail that was
18 sent electronically and the new law library supervisor does not know how to access it. He also
19 generally ask for an extension to all pending motions to which he needs to respond.

20 Defendants respond that the SDCC law librarian may have been out of the office due to
21 COVID-19 related issues, but has returned and there is a back-up procedure to ensure that legal
22 mail is delivered when the librarian is absent. (ECF No. 147). As such, Defendants claim that
23 Plaintiff's request is moot. Plaintiff replies that he is not aware of any new procedure to ensure
24 that legal mail is delivered. He does not believe that "everything will magically get better."
25 (ECF No. 149).

26 Unfortunately, Plaintiff's Motion cannot be granted for several reasons. First, he fails to
27 cite to any points and authorities for why the Court should compel Defendants to provide him
28 with copies of the entire docket. He does not identify any date range in which he did not receive

1 cm/ecf service of filings. Plaintiff does not even identify which motions he needs extensions to
2 respond. As such, the Court is unable to grant the relief requested. It notes that to the extent that
3 there is a back-up procedure as represented by Defendants, then Defendants should follow-up to
4 ensure that is in place when the law librarian is out.

5 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Order re Service (ECF No.
6 145) is **denied**.

7 DATED: December 16, 2020.



DANIEL J. ALBRECTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE